

the postmaster general has told its top managers that they could see performance bonuses of up to 25 percent of their salaries."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think when an agency or a business, whatever it might be, is losing a projected \$2 billion this year, yet they are giving bonuses to their top management of 25 percent, with the taxpayers of this country who use the postal system paying the freight for that increase, there is something wrong.

The second part of the paragraph says, "The postal service has increased postal rates twice this year, but United States Postal Service officials are still projecting a deficit of \$1.6 billion to \$2.4 billion, blaming higher fuel costs and increasing competition from online services."

Mr. Speaker, the reason I wanted to come forward is because in the year 2000, the post office ended the year with a \$1.9 million loss, yet that same year, the year 2000, they paid out \$197 million in bonuses to employees. Again, I came to the floor tonight because I think there is something seriously wrong when the U.S. Postal Service is losing that kind of money yet paying those kind of bonuses.

In this great Nation that we live, America, we are usually rewarded for being successful, not for losing money and then charging the customer the rates they have been charging. Let me read a couple other points to my colleagues.

This is from the Federal Times Postal News, and it says "The outlook may appear sour for this year for the U.S. Postal Service, which is facing a potential \$2 billion deficit, but many postal service executives may be on the brink of a banner year. Postmaster General John Potter told top postal executives if the postal service continues increasing productivity this year, their bonuses could amount to 25 percent of their salaries."

He says they are increasing productivity, yet they are still losing between \$1 billion and \$2 billion. That is kind of laughable to me, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker. Let me also mention that in 2000, which I mentioned earlier, they paid out over \$208 million while losing money.

Mr. Speaker, I guess the reason I wanted to come to the floor tonight is simply to point out that the American people are looking to those of us in the United States Congress to tell the post office to get their act straight, to start serving the people and making some money, and then maybe those bonuses will be worth it.

I have put in a resolution that would deal with this. It is a nonbinding resolution, quite frankly, but it would give Members of the House a chance to come to the floor and talk about the fact that they are not worthy of this kind of increase in their bonuses, in my opinion.

I will make quick reference to a Washington Times article of this past

Friday called "Going Postal Bonus," and it talks about just how absolutely ridiculous it is that the post office is giving themselves this kind of bonus and raise when they are losing money.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to say to my fellow colleagues in the United States House of Representatives that I hope my colleagues will support my nonbinding resolution so we can come to the floor of the House and speak on behalf of those small businesses and patrons of the United States Postal Service who are paying a whole lot in increases while the executives, who are losing money, up to \$2 billion, are giving themselves a bonus.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), would say, shame on them and shame on us if we do not debate this on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO ISABEL BRIGGS MYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an interesting conference that will soon take place in my congressional district. On September 20 and 22, 2001, Hartwick College in Oneonta, New York, is sponsoring a symposium in honor of a truly remarkable woman: Isabel Briggs Myers. Isabel Briggs Myers devoted more than half her lifetime to the observation, study, and measurement of personality and gave us the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the most widely used personality instrument in the world.

The story of Isabel Myers and the Type Indicator is unique in the history of psychology and shows how much a single individual can achieve in the face of formidable obstacles. The story begins with Isabel's mother, Katharine Cook Briggs, a thinker, a reader, and a quiet observer who became intrigued with the similarities and differences in human personality. Katharine Cook Briggs became interested in the work of a Swiss psychologist named Carl Jung. She passed that interest on to her daughter, Isabel.

Isabel Briggs, after being home schooled except for a year in public school, entered Swarthmore College at age 17 and graduated first in her class in 1919. At the end of her junior year, she married Clarence Myers. Until the outbreak of World War II, she functioned as a mother and homemaker although she found time to publish two successful mystery novels.

The outbreak of World War II stirred her desire to contribute to the national effort. With the departure of much of the male workforce into the armed services and the emergence of many women new to the industrial workplace to fill their jobs, she saw a place where she could help. She was convinced that an understanding for human personality differences could help a person find a successful and rewarding kind of job and avoid unnecessary stress and conflict. Having long since absorbed her mother's admiration of Jungian typology, she determined to devise a method of making the theory of practical use. Thus was born the idea of the Type Indicator.

With no formal training in psychology, with no academic sponsorship or research grants, Isabel Myers began the painstaking task of developing a set of questions that would tap the attitudes, feelings, perceptions, and behaviors of the different psychological types as she and her mother had come to understand them. A habitual reader, she haunted libraries and taught herself what she needed to know of statistics and test construction. She persuaded countless school principals in eastern Pennsylvania to allow her to test their students, and she spent many a long evening scoring questions and tabulating data.

Isabel Myers Briggs spent decades working to perfect the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. At the age of 82, she was still at work on a revised manual for the indicator, long after she was profoundly weakened by her final illness. Today, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has been translated into over 30 languages and is used by career counselors, colleges and universities, the Department of Defense, and numerous corporations.

On September 22, 2001, Hartwick College will confer, posthumously, an honorary doctorate degree to Isabel Briggs Myers. It is well deserved.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to bid the symposium attendees and Isabel's family my best wishes for the success of their event; and I applaud their desire to honor such an able scholar and true visionary: Isabel Briggs Myers.

SUPPORT OF BIPARTISAN PATIENT PROTECTION ACT, H.R. 2563

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to voice my strong support of the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry patients' bill of rights. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill which our wise counterparts in the Senate passed more than 1 month ago.

Over 800 organizations endorse the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry patient bill of rights, and numerous surveys show overwhelming support for the

kind of bipartisan commonsense protections this bill provides. We must pass this bill and not delay or deny the American public what so many of us have promised them time and time again since 1998.

More than 160 million Americans receive health services through managed care. Sixty-three percent of the insured population in this country have employment-based insurance. This patients' bill of rights would not only ensure a basic minimal level of health care for these Americans but also ensure that doctors, and not bureaucrats, are making decisions when it comes to patient care.

We must pass the newly revised Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry patients' bill of rights, H.R. 2563. This bill gives HMO patients the right to choose their own doctor, covers all Americans with employer-based insurance, ensures that external reviews are conducted by independent and qualified physicians, and holds a plan accountable when it makes a decision that harms or kills someone. It also provides access to emergency room care, OB-GYNs, pediatricians, specialty care providers, and clinical trials and prescription drugs.

And while it does allow patients to sue in Federal and State courts, the newly revised bill makes it clear that employers will not be sued for wrongs committed by health plans. It limits employer liability by providing an exemption for self-employed plans and permitting employers to appoint a decisionmaker to immunize them from lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, this legislation narrows the scope of defined violations to provide meaningful protections for employers trying to provide the best care they can for employers and employees.

Mr. Speaker, an understandable and equally important concern for many of America's hardworking employers is the increased cost of providing health care for their employees. H.R. 2563 has been crafted to minimize this risk as well. The Congressional Budget Office issued a cost analysis of the McCain-Edwards-Kennedy bill, which is virtually identical to H.R. 2563, and concluded it would increase health insurance premiums by only a de minimis amount.

Moreover, a cost increase may never occur, since many HMOs have changed their policies over the past 3 years to ensure that patients can obtain medically necessary care. I applaud these HMOs and hope that others will follow, especially since some Members of the House seem determined to never let H.R. 2563 be considered on the House floor. I think that would be a travesty, Mr. Speaker. This patients' bill of rights represents a critical step toward improving our health care system by placing control of patient care firmly in the hands of patients and their doctors.

I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think of their constitu-

ents and the promises that we have made to improve health care in America. We must pass meaningful health care reform. We must pass this patients' bill of rights, and we must do it now.

RURAL CLEANSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land. If we gave every department or agency up here twice what they are getting now, they would be happy for a short time but then they would be coming back to us crying about a shortfall in funding. But it is this threat to land and to private property that especially concerns me tonight.

The Federal Government today owns over 30 percent of the land in this country, and State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies own another 20 percent. So that half the land today is in some type of public control.

□ 2015

The alarming thing is the rapid rate at which that government control of land has been increasing in the last 30 or 40 years. Then on top of that, we continue to put more and more restrictions on what people can do with the private property that remains in their hands.

We have to realize at some point, Mr. Speaker, that private property is one of the few things that has set us apart from countries like the former Soviet Union and Cuba and other socialist and communist nations. We need to recognize that private property is a very, very important part of our freedom and our prosperity.

I have talked about these restrictions on what people can do with their land. There are groups all over the country that protest any time anybody wants to dig for coal, drill for any oil, cut any trees, or produce any natural gas. What they are doing is hurting the poor and lower- and middle-income people most of all by destroying jobs and driving up prices on everything.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues tonight a column that was in the Wall Street Journal a few days ago called "Rural Cleansing" by Kimberley Strassel, who is an assistant editor and columnist for the Wall Street Journal.

She wrote a column, most of which I want to read at this time. She talks about the cut off of water to 1,500 farm families in Oregon and California's Klamath Basin in April because of the sucker fish: "The environmental groups behind the cut off continue to declare that they were simply concerned for the welfare of a bottom feeder. But last month these environmentalists revealed another motive

when they submitted a polished proposal for the government to buy off the farmers and move them off their lands. This is what is really happening in Klamath. Call it rural cleansing. It is repeating itself in environmental battles across the country.

"Indeed, the goal of many environmental groups from the Sierra Club and others is no longer to protect nature. It is to expunge humans from the countryside.

"The strategy of these environmental groups is nearly always the same. To sue or lobby the government into declaring rural areas off limits to people who live and work there. The tools for doing this include the Endangered Species Act and local preservation laws. In some cases, owners lose their property outright. More often, the environmentalists' goal is to have restrictions placed on the land that either render it unusable or persuade owners to leave of their own accord."

The column continues that there was a court decision in this case. "Since that decision, the average value of an acre of farm property in Klamath has dropped from \$2,500 to about \$35. Most owners have no other source of income. So with the region suitably desperate, the enviros dropped their bomb. Last month they submitted a proposal urging the government to buy the farmers off.

"The council has suggested a price of \$4,000 an acre which makes it more likely the owners will sell only to the government. While the amount is more than the property's original value, it is nowhere near enough to compensate people for the loss of their livelihoods and their children's future.

"The environmental groups have picked their fight specifically with the farmers but its acts will likely mean the death of an entire community. The farming industry there will lose \$250 million this year. But the property tax revenues will also decrease under new property assessments. That will strangle road and municipal projects. Local business are dependent on the farmers and are now suffering financially. Should the farm acreage be cleared of people entirely meaning no tax and no shoppers, the community is likely to disappear."

"Environmentalists argue," this columnist continues, "that farmers should never have been in the dry Klamath Valley in the first place and that they put undue stress on the land. But the West is a primarily arid region. Its history is one of turning inhospitable areas into thriving communities through prudent and thoughtful relocation of water."

The columnist goes on, "But, of course, this is the goal. Environmentalist groups have spoken openly of their desire to concentrate people into the cities turning everything outside city limits into a giant park. Do the people who give money to environmental groups realize the end game is to evict people from their land? I doubt it."